

RemarksClaim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Independent claims 1, 16 and 19 have been amended to recite that the establishment of the second path is performed "at the same time as" the establishment of the first path. This distinguishes from Christie which as the Examiner has implicitly admitted on page 8 of the office action under the heading "Response to Arguments", carries out these steps in series.

Accordingly the rejection of claims 1, 16 and 19 as being anticipated by Christie is respectfully traversed since Christie does not show all the claimed features. Similarly, since claim 6 depends from claim 1, it is submitted that this claim is not anticipated by Christie at least by virtue of its dependency.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The combined teachings of Christie and Chuah do not, for the reasons given above, disclose path selection and session establishment processes occurring at the same time (as explained for example on pages 18-20 of the specification).


Furthermore, all that Chuah contributes is the possibility of using label switching to group together IP packets when appropriate with the possibility (although no detailed implementation is given) of flagging particular packets with a class of service indicator.

Accordingly the rejection of claims 2-5, 17 and 18 based on Christie in view of Chuah, is respectfully traversed.

Favorable reconsideration is therefore urged. This response is being filed within two months following the office action (June 8, 2003 is a Sunday).

June 6, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26,935
Barnes & Thornburg
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 368-6620
(312) 368-0034 (fax)